UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/509,939	10/01/2004	Risto Nikander	P08398US00/DEJ	4953
881 7590 02/19/2010 STITES & HARBISON PLLC 1199 NORTH FAIRFAX STREET SUITE 900			EXAMINER	
			LAZORCIK, JASON L	
ALEXANDRIA	A, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/19/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/509,939	NIKANDER, RISTO
Examiner initiation interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	JASON L. LAZORCIK	1791
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>JASON L. LAZORCIK</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Douglas E. Jackson (Reg. No. 28,518)</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 2 February 2010	Time: <u>4:20pm</u>	
Type of Interview:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar 	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Jason L Lazorcik/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791 (A	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

February 2, 2010;

Applicant was advised that after careful review the present amendments to claim 1, dated November 9, 2009, fail to overcome the rejection of claims in the official Action dated May 8, 2009. Applicant was however advised that incorporation of additional structure and/or operational details regarding the glass stopping arrangement (see paragraphs 0029-0030) would read over the prior art of record and may place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant was directed to present proposed claim language for further discussion by February 5, 2010.

February 15, 2010:

Applicant was unable to timely present proposed amendments. A final rejection was issued in response to Applicants reply dated November 9, 2009, however Applicant was invited to contact the Examier to further discuss the potentially allowable subject material as deemed necessary by Applicant.